

Applicant had a discussion with the Examiner on July 16, 2009 and it was agreed that Applicant would submit amended claims bringing the claims in line with the claims that were to be examined. The amendments to the claims listed above bring the claim set in line with what should have been examined.

#### Oath/Declaration-Part 3

Applicant is confused by the assertion that the oath or declaration is defective with respect to Inventor Hort. As seen in the originally filed oath/declaration (Exhibit C), Inventor Hort is clearly identified as being a citizen of Australia and residing in Sydney, NSW. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the originally filed oath/declaration again.

#### Drawings-Part 4

Applicant has amended the claims to remove reference to microswitches in Claim 4.

#### Specification-Parts 5 and 6

Please see the amendments to specification above removing “means” language and also correcting other informalities.

#### Claim Objections-Part 7

As mentioned above when responding to Parts 1 and 2, it appears that the Examiner never received the proper claim set to examine. The multiple dependant claims were removed in the claim set filed with the National Stage application. Applicant has now further amended the claims to correct earlier claim set errors.

#### Claim Rejections- 35 USC 112-Parts 8 and 9

In the set of claims that should have been examined, Applicant had made significant amendments to claims 1-5 and 32-37. Applicant believes that these amendments, had they been examined, would have prevented the rejection of failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The Examiner has also raised some questions with Page 12, lines 21-27 as not being clear as to what holds head 58 on the fastener 60. There is nothing that holds the head 58 on the fastener 60. The head 58 is simply part of the fastener 60. This was a description to describe what end of the fastener 60 was being engaged into the clip 62.

Brace 134 is exactly as described. It provides a bracing for the support 132. See Page 14, lines 17-18.

The Examiner has raised the issue that it is not clear how Figure 4, Figure 13 or Figures 16-18 work. Applicant believes that the claim amendments will help to clarify this situation and asks that the Examiner consider the claim amendments in light of the specification.

#### Claim Rejections 35 USC 102, 103-Parts 10-17

Applicant believes that the examination of the proper claim amendments should be made before unnecessarily replying to claim rejections that may not be relevant and may possibly be moot. It is unknown if the Examiner would make the same rejections had he had the proper claim set. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the new claim set and issue any rejections based on that claim set rather than one that was not to be examined.

**Authorization**

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Reply, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3791.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Director is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 50-3791.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 4, 2009

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Heather A. Kartsounes", written over a horizontal line.

Heather A. Kartsounes

Registration No. 53,732

Attorney for Applicants